

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/935,746

Applicant(s)

SAKAMAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Steven H. Rao

Art Unit

2814

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven H. Rao.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Jesse O. Collier ( 53,839).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 08 May 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1-5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Suzuki.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ex. Rao explained why the applied reference reads on pending claims and AR Collier explained what the references lack. Ex. Rao suggested that Applicants' submit a written response with any supporting material and the Examiner will consider it in view of AR Collier's contentions during the interview.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required